1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Responding Defendant) hereby responds to Plaintiff First Set of Request for Admissions. The number of responses below correspond to the number of Plaintiffs' requests and in each case, L&T International reserves the right to supplement its response to any particular request a later time as new becomes available.

> RECEIVED The Law Offices of Joe Hill Attorney_at, Law

Rec'd by:

1

1	REQUEST NO. 21: Admit that pursuant to the Nonresident Workers Act (3 CMC §§ 4437[c];
2	4438[b]), defendant-employer was required to pay the fees for plaintiffs' health certificates.
3	RESPONSE: Objection Vague as to time. Responding Defendant denies that pursuant to the
4	Nonresident Workers Act (3 CMC §§ 4437[c]; 4438[b]), defendant-employer was required to pay
5	the fees for plaintiffs' health certificates prior to employment with the Responding Defendant.
6	
7	REQUEST NO. 25: Admit or deny that plaintiffs' employment was terminated without just cause.
8	RESPONSE: Responding Defendant denies that plaintiffs' employment was terminated without
9	just cause.
10	
11	REQUEST NO. 26: Admit that defendant did not give each plaintiff ten (10) days advance written
12	notice before termination.
13	RESPONSE: Responding Defendant denies that defendant did not give each plaintiff ten (10) days
14	advance written notice before termination.
15	
16	REQUEST NO. 28: Admit that defendant hired Chinese workers who performed the work of Hand
17	Packers during the period from February 1, 2004 through April 1, 2006.
18	RESPONSE: Admit.
19	
20	REQUEST NO. 31: Admit that plaintiffs did not read the substantive content of their employment
21	contract prior to signing.
22	RESPONSE: Responding Defendant admits that some of the Plaintiffs testified in depositions that
23	they did not read the substantive content of their employment contract prior to signing. Except to the
24	extent admitted, L&T lacks sufficient information to admit or deny request No. 31 despite
2010	reasonable inquiry conducted to date

2
3
4

REQUEST NO. 35: Admit that defendant is obligated to pay plaintiffs' return airfare to the Philippines.

RESPONSE: Responding Defendant admits that defendant is obligated to pay plaintiffs' return airfare to the Philippines to the extent provided for in the non-resident worker contract and according to CNMI law.

Dated this 30th day of August, 2006.

COLIN M. THOMSON Attorney at Law